

A-3930 - Application No. 10/799,098  
Response to Office action June 15, 2009  
Response submitted September 15, 2009

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 3-8, 12, 13, and 15-17 remain in the application.  
Claims 6 and 16 have been amended. Claims 2, 9-11, and 14  
were previously cancelled.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action,  
claims 6-8, 12, 13, and 15-17 have been rejected as being  
fully anticipated by Lyman (U.S. Patent No. 3,236,517) under  
35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended  
in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the  
instant application. The claims are patentable for the  
reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on  
page 7, lines 15-18 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that  
a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 6 and 16 call for, *inter alia*:

a transport belt for transporting the sheets, and a lifting device for reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in an overlapping stream on the transport belt by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet.

The Lyman reference discloses a sheet handling apparatus that has guide tracks (90, 91) defining a path which surrounds the sheets. The sheets are transported one after another along guide surfaces (41) of the guide tracks (90, 91) by airstreams. Lyman does not disclose a transport belt which transports the sheets.

The reference does not show a transport belt for transporting the sheets, and a lifting device for reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in an overlapping stream on the transport belt by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet, as recited in claims 6 and 16 of the instant application. Lyman discloses guide tracks which guide the sheets one after another. Lyman does not disclose a transport belt. This is contrary to the present invention as claimed, which recites a transport belt for transporting the sheets, and a lifting device for reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in an

overlapping stream on the transport belt by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet.

Since claims 6 and 16 are allowable over Lyman, dependent claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, and 17 are allowable over Lyman as well.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 6, 12, 13, 15, and 17 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Lyman (U.S. Patent No. 3,243,181) (hereinafter "Lyman2") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The Lyman2 reference discloses a sheet handling apparatus that has track lengths (11, 21) defining a path which surrounds the sheets. The tracks lengths (11, 21) are contoured to have a mirror profile. The sheets are transported along guide surfaces (20 and 27) of the track lengths (11, 21) by airstreams directed through conduits. Lyman2 does not disclose a transport belt which transports the sheets.

The reference does not show a transport belt for transporting the sheets, and a lifting device for reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in an overlapping stream on the transport belt by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet, as recited in claims 6 and 16

of the instant application. Lyman2 discloses track lengths which guide the sheets one after another. Lyman2 does not disclose a transport belt. This is contrary to the present invention as claimed, which recites a transport belt for transporting the sheets, and a lifting device for reducing an adhesion force between two sheets following one another in an overlapping stream on the transport belt by lifting a sheet trailing edge of a first sheet.

Since claims 6 and 16 are allowable over Lyman2, dependent claims 12, 13, 15, and 17 are allowable over Lyman2 as well.

It is appreciatively noted from item 4 on page 6 of the Office action that claims 1 and 3-5 are allowed.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 6 or 16. Claim 6 and 16 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 6 or 16, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 6-8, 12, 13, and 15-17 are solicited.

A-3930 - Application No. 10/799,098  
Response to Office action June 15, 2009  
Response submitted September 15, 2009

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alfred K. Dassler/

Alfred K. Dassler  
Reg. No.: 52,794

AKD:sa

September 15, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101